

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the September 21, 2007 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 1-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph because the non-arbitrary application identifier is not enabled. Applicants amend the claims remove the requirement of being non-arbitrary. By removing the non-arbitrary element, Applicants fix all the 112 objections, and thus Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now comply with all requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,477,645 issued to Drews in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0023059 to Bari, et al. . The rejection asserts that Drews allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for a master credential, which is allegedly taught by Bari. Claims 1-23 are canceled herein.

The remaining claims each include the elements of generating the server credential using the application identifier and a master credential, wherein the master credential allows the device to be authenticated to other entities and transmitting the server credential to the data server, wherein if the server credential and the application credential match, the application is authenticated.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests such an invention. Under the present claims, if the application identifier and the application credential are transmitted without error, then it will be determined that the apparatus for operating the application and the credential server have the same master credential. As stated in the office action, Drews does not teach a master credential. The action relies on paragraph [0036] of Bari to teach the master credential. However, in the current specification, the master credential is defined as being “installed in the device during manufacture or by using some other secure procedure. The master credential 114 may be any type of suitable credential that is not made public to allow the device to authenticated to other entities, such as the credential server 108.” (specification, paragraph [0030] as filed). Bari does not teach such a master credential. Although Bari uses the term “Master Credential,” Bari is referring to an entirely different type of entity. Bari teaches the “master credential” is a user identifier, such as a password, e-mail address, biometrics, voice detection, or any other type of technology to identify a user (paragraphs [0036-0037]). Thus, Bari is directed to a master credential to identify a user, sort of like a password vault. By contrast, the master credential in the present claims allows the device to be authenticated, not the user. Because the present claims require a device level master credential, and Bari only teaches a user level master credential, the master credential in Bari cannot be used to teach the master credential in the present claims which require the master credential to allow the device to be authenticated to other entities.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 24, 28, 32, 36 and 40 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 24, 28, 32, 36 and 40 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 24, 28, 32, 36 and 40.

Claims 25-27, 29-31, 33-35, 37-39 and 41-45 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from

which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 24, 28, 32, 36 and 40, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25-27, 29-31, 33-35, 37-39 and 41-45 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 25-27, 29-31, 33-35, 37-39 and 41-45.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated December 23, 2007

By: /James T. Hagler/

James T. Hagler
Reg. No. 40,631
(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502